

### REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on June 4, 2003, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1-3, 7, 9, 27-29, 31, and 33 are amended and claim 8 is canceled; as a result, claims 1-7 and 9-118 are now pending in this application.

#### §102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1 and 7-8 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Slavik (U.S. Patent No. 4,617,472). Claim 8 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

#### Claim 1

Applicant has amended claim 1 to better describe the subject matter recited in the claim. Applicant believes claim 1 is not anticipated by Slavik since Slavik does not include each limitation recited in the claim. For instance, a power control system that includes “a sensor for automatically determining the amp service level of the shore power input to the recreational vehicle,” and “means for setting an electrical system not to exceed the sensed amp service level of the shore power.” In contrast, Slavik discusses a system including a line voltage sensor 54 to determine the shore power voltage. (Col. 4, lines 20-35). This is done to determine whether the voltage is adequate or inadequate for the load (such as an air conditioner) coupled to the shore power. Slavik does not describe any technique for determining the shore amp service, however. Such a system allows the amp level of the source to be determined to allow for the electrical devices to be controlled as necessary. Again, Slavik does not teach or even suggest such subject matter since Slavik is concerned with connecting and disconnecting appliances when the power voltage falls below a given threshold. The control system of the present claim determines from the outset what the shore amp service is to let it then control the electrical device coupled to the system. Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

#### Claim 7

Applicant has amended claim 7 to better describe the subject matter recited in the claim. Applicant believes claim 7 is not anticipated by the Slavik reference since the reference does not include each limitation recited in the claim. For instance, a control system including “a network

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

coupled to two or more sources of energy,” the network having a first node associated with a first device of a plurality of devices, a second node associated with a second device of the plurality of devices, and a microprocessor for running a set of commands to control the first device and the second device, “wherein the network controls electrical loads and controls which source of energy is supplying power to the electrical loads.” In contrast, Slavik controls devices coupled to a shore power source, but Slavik does not discuss or suggest coupling the devices to two or more energy sources and then controlling which source is to supply the power to the devices. Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

*§103 Rejection of the Claims*

Claims 3-4 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slavik (U.S. Patent No. 4,617,472) in view of Parks et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,504,339). Applicant traverses. Even of combined, the combination would not include the subject matter discussed above for amended parent claim 1. Moreover, Parks does not discuss a rechargeable power source wherein the amount of current used to recharge the rechargeable power source is automatically adjusted based on the amount of available shore or generator power, as asserted by the Office Action. In contrast, Parks discusses recharging based on the available fuel for a fuel cell. Also, there is no suggestion or motivation to combine the two references. Slavik is concerned with connecting or disconnecting loads based on shore voltage. There is no suggestion to combine a fuel cell or battery in the Slavik system. Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-43, 45-52, 54-58, 60, 62-64, 67 and 69-70 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slavik (U.S. Patent No. 4,617,472) in view of Parks et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,504,339) as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Wagner et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,055,163). Applicant traverses. Claims 9-43, 45-52, 54-58, 60, 62-64, 67 and 69-70 depend from claim 7. Even of combined, the combination would not include the subject matter discussed above for amended parent claim 7. For instance a network that “controls electrical loads and controls which source of energy is supplying power to the electrical loads.” As noted above, Slavik does not include such subject matter. Wagner also does not discuss such subject

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

matter. Wagner discusses delivering power from a generator to an electrical grid. Wagner cannot control the electrical load, as claimed.

Moreover, Applicant believes there is no motivation to combine the references as suggested. As noted, Wagner is directed to controlling power to an electrical grid while Slavik is controlling devices in a vehicle. These are two different applications and teachings from one field do not apply to the other field.

Regarding claims 10-13, 15-16, 18 Applicant cannot find any teaching in Wagner regarding vehicle information, or fuel levels of vehicles, etc, as recited in the claims. Applicant traverses the characterization in the Office Action that Wagner teaches such subject matter.

Regarding claims 19-20, Applicant cannot find in Wagner any discussion of the cited subject matter.

Regarding claims 33 and 34, Applicant cannot find in Wagner any discussion of "the load control capable of enabling the second source of power in anticipation of a condition when the power demand exceeds a level of available power from the first source of power." In contrast, Wagner only can tell demand after an appliance is on. Wagner cannot anticipate demand.

Claims 44 and 53 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slavik (U.S. Patent No. 4,617,472) in view of Goldstein et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,429,019). Claim 68 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slavik (U.S. Patent No. 4,617,472), Wagner et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,055,163) and Parks et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,504,339) as applied to claim 40 above, and further in view of Goldstein et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,429,019).

Claims 44, 53, and 68 include each limitation of their parent claim 7, and are not obvious in view of the cited references for the reasons given above, since the secondary references do not overcome the deficiency of the main reference as discussed above. Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 59, 61 and 65-66 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slavik (U.S. Patent No. 4,617,472), Wagner et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,055,163) and Parks et al.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

(U.S. Patent No. 6,504,339) as applied to claim 40 above, and further in view of Balch et al.

(U.S. Patent No. 4,634,887).

Claims 44, 53, and 68 include each limitation of their parent claim 7, and are not obvious in view of the cited references for the reasons given above, since the secondary references do not overcome the deficiency of the main reference as discussed above. Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney ((612) 359-3267) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID J. KOENIG ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
(612) 359-3267

Date 12/3/03

By Peter C. Maki  
Peter C. Maki  
Reg. No. 42,832

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O.Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of December, 2003.

Dawn M. Poole

Name

Dawn M. Poole

Signature

USPTO AVAILABLE COPY